UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/810,534	03/19/2001	Masahiro Machida	108973	6709

25944   7590   06/25/2008
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 320850
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850

EXAMINER
KE, PENG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10/25/07*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-7 and 9-22* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-7 and 9-22* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e)

has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to

37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/25/07 has been entered.

Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-22 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 7, 13, 14, 16, 18, 20,

and 22 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4-7, 10-12, 13, 14, 16-18, and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Collard US Patent 6,181,893 in view of Bleizeffer US Patent 6,115,720.

As per claim 1, Collard teaches an operating method for sequentially performing setting

for plural items in a predetermined order, the method comprising:

Storing plural setting frames provided to the respective plural items; (see Collard; figure

4, column 7, lines 20-50)

Displaying, in a single frame of a display device, one of the stored plural setting meanu

display data of plural items to be set; (see Collard; figure 4, column 7, lines 20-50)

Allowing an operator to input an instruction from to perform setting of the plural item through the display device; (see Collard, column 7, lines 10-20) and

Performing setting of the plural items in accordance with the inputted instruction; (see Collard, column 9, lines 25-40) wherein

When setting of a first item which is being set is performed based on the inputted instruction, (see Collard; column 6, lines 45-65) setting menu display data of a second item that is next to the first item in the predetermined order is displayed, and the first item displays the selected item. (see Collard; column 6, lines 35-46)

Collard further teaches an item which is being an item which has been already set, an item which is being set along with parameters to choose from, and an item which has not yet been set are displayed in the single frame so that the item that is being set is distinguishable from item which has been already set and item which has not yet been set. (see column 7, lines 25-45; figure 4, "Basic Settings" is displayed differently from the rest of the items.)

However, Collard fails to teach an item which has been already set is distinguishable from another an item which has not yet been set.

Bleizeffer teaches an item which has been already set is distinguishable from another an item which has not yet been set. (see Bleizeffer, column2, lines 44-61; figure 18, column 13, lines 15-55)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Bleizeffer's teaching with method of Collard in order to allow users to distinguish what is done and what is not.

As per claim 4, Collard and Bleizeffer teach the operating method as claimed in claim 1.
Collard further teaches wherein an operation of displaying a setting frame for an item which has
been already set is allowed to be carried out when one of the plural setting frames is displayed.
(see Collard; figure 4, column 7, lines 20-50)

As per claim 5, Collard and Bleizeffer teach the operating method as claimed in claim 4.
Bleizeffer further teaches wherein the setting frame for the item which has been already set is
displayed, the setting for the item is carried out, and the setting frame being displayed is
automatically restored to a previous setting frame which is displayed just before the setting frame
for the item which has been already set is displayed. (see Bleizeffer; column 11, lines 31-column
12, line 10)

As per claim 6, Collard and Bleizeffer teach the operating method as claimed in claim 5.
Bleizeffer further teaches wherein when the setting frame is restored to the previous setting
frame, a state which has been just previously set is maintained. (see Bleizeffer, column 11, lines
31-column12, lines 10)

As per claims 7 and 10-12, they are of similar scope to claims 1 and 4-6 respectively, and are rejected under the same rationale.

As per claim 13, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 1. Supra.

As per claim 14, Collard teaches an operating method for sequentially performing settings for plural items in a predetermined order to perform settings for a processor, the method of: comprising:

displaying, in a single frame of a display device, all of the plural items and one of plural setting menu display data of plural items to be set; (see Collard; figure 4, column 7, lines 20-50)

inputting an instruction from an operator to perform setting of the plural items through the display device; (see Collard, column 7, lines 10-20)

setting the plural items in accordance with the inputted instruction; (see Collard; column 6, lines 45-65)

carrying out a processing operation of the processor on the basis of contents set for the plural items; (see Collard, column 9, lines 25-40) and

maintaining the contents set for the plural items;

wherein when setting of a first item which is being set is performed based on the inputted instruction, (see Collard; column 6, lines 45-65) the display unit displays a setting menu display data of a second item that is next to the first item in the predetermined order, and the first item

displays the selected item. (see Collard; column 6, lines 35-46) and

Collard further teaches an item which is being an item which has been already set, an

item which is being set along with parameters to choose from, and an item which has not yet

been set are displayed in the single frame so that the item that is being set is distinguishable from

item which has been already set and item which has not yet been set. (see column 7, lines 25-45;

figure 4, "Basic Settings" is displayed differently from the rest of the items.)

However, Collard fails to teach an item which has been already set is distinguishable

from one another an item which has not yet been set.

Bleizeffer teaches an item which has been already set is distinguishable from one another

an item which has not yet been set. (see Bleizeffer, column2, lines 44-61; figure 18, column 13,

lines 15-55)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include

Bleizeffer's teaching with method of Collard in order allow users to distinguish what is done and

what is not.

As per claim 16, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 14. Supra.

As per claim 17, Collard and Bleizeffer teach operating method as claimed in claim 16.

Bleizeffer further teaches wherein the instruction is provided on an initial frame. (see Bleizeffer;

figure, the instruction on the right side of the frame is the initial instruction)

As per claim 18, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 14. Supra.

As per claim 20, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 14. Supra.

As per claim 21, it is of the same scope as claim 17. Supra.

AS per claim 22, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 14. Supra.

Claims 3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over anticipated Collard US Patent 6,181,893 in view of Bleizeffer US Patent 6,115,720 further in view of Wehmeyer US Patent 5,543,857.

As per claim 3, Collard and Bleizeffer teach the method of claim 1. They fail to teach wherein values which have been set are displayed for the items-item which have-has been already set.

Wehmeyer teaches values which have been set are displayed for the items-item which have-has been already set. (see Wehmeyer, figure 4, items, "mute", "TV only", and "Stereo")

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Wehmeyer's teaching method of Bleizeffer in order to provide user with an intuitive object oriented guide which naturally, and in a non-confusing fashion, lead the viewer to the correct control for accomplishing his task.

As per claim 9, it is rejected under the same scope as claim 9. Supra.

Claims 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over anticipated Collard US Patent 6,181,893 in view of Bleizeffer US Patent 6,115,720 further in view of Shiels, U.S. Patent 5,751,953.

As per claim 15, Collard and Bleizeffer teaches the operating method as claimed in claim 14. They fail to teach wherein after the processing operation of the processor is executed, an

instruction can be provided as to whether the contents set for the plural items are maintained or the contents set are cleared.

Shiels teaches wherein after a processing operation of the processor is executed, an instruction can be provided as to whether the contents set for the plural items are maintained or the contents set are cleared (se Shiels, column 7, lines 32-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Shiels with the method of Bleizeffer and Wehmeyer in order to allow a user to save or discard settings set for a particular process.

As per claim 19, it is of similar scope to claim 15 and it rejected under the same rationale as claim 15. Supra.

Response to Argument

Applicant's arguments filed 10/25/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument focused on the following:

A) Whether Collard teaches a setting menu display data of a second item that is next the first item in the predetermined order is displayed?

A) Collard teaches this limitation because it displays multiple setting menu for different items simultaneously in a predetermined order. (see Collard, figure 4, col. 7, lines 30-70)

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peng Ke whose telephone number is (571) 272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Peng Ke
/Peng Ke/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174